

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 13-18, 22 and 23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 14 are amended, and claims 4, 7-12 and 19-21 have been withdrawn by the June 29, 2005 Office Action as drawn to a non-elected species. However, it is requested they be rejoined when claim 1, from which they depend directly or indirectly, is allowed.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Office Action's acknowledgment of allowable subject matter in claims 17 and 18.

II. 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By this Amendment, claim 14 has been amended to clarify the objectionable text. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn. It is submitted that the amendment is non-narrowing and not necessary to patentability as one skilled in the art would understand such notation to be standard array description.

III. 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Tsuda et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,313,895, (Tsuda); and claims 13-16 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tsuda in view of Kanou et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,474,718, (Kanou). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Tsuda fails to disclose an electro-optic device having a multiplicity of pixels grouped into plural units each including a plurality of pixels, with a recess/projection pattern being formed to provide a different pattern for each pixel at least in each of the units, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 2.

Tsuda fails to disclose all of the features recited in claims 1 and 2 because the "units" of Tsuda (characterized in the Office Action as cols. 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Tsuda Fig. 2) do not have a different pattern for each pixel in each of the "units" identified in Fig. 2 of Tsuda. As shown in Fig. 2 of Tsuda, it can be seen that the "column 1" (identified as the leftmost column of Fig. 2 in the Office Action) has the same pattern for the topmost and bottommost pixels of the "column 1 unit." The same is disclosed in Fig. 5(b) of Tsuda. Using the same unit structure described in the Office Action, it can be seen that the leftmost column of exposure face A has the same pattern for the topmost and bottommost pixels and for the two pixels in the center of the leftmost column. The same is also seen in the other columns in Fig. 5(b). Tsuda thus fails to disclose a grouping of pixels into plural units that have a different pattern for each pixel in each of the units.

In view of the foregoing, Tsuda fails to disclose all of the features recited in claims 1 and 2, as well as the additional features recited in the dependent claims thereof. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven W. Allis
Registration No. 50,532

JAO:SWA/jam

Date: September 9, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--